



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Morris, who arrived in the same year, found events moving too rapidly. His conservatism forced him into a strange rôle—the minister of the Great Republic, he preached incessantly moderation; for he perceived that Frenchmen, in their political childhood, could not safely march to liberty *au pas de charge*. Mr. Hazen corrects Taine, who gives to Morris's expression, "Autorité is a name, not a real existence," the date of July 19, 1789, in a letter to Washington. The author proves it to have been written on July 1st in a letter to Jay. The latter date would show political acumen on the part of Morris, for on July 1st the Bastille still stood, and "Broglie the War-God" was fulminating on the Champ de Mars.

It is well known that the American Revolution was potent in beginning the revolution in France, but, perhaps, not so generally recognized that the French Revolution, once begun, was, in its turn, dominant in America. This Mr. Hazen has forcibly shown in the second part of his book. The first trumpetings of liberty in France sounded across the sea, and a nation, newly-emancipated and grateful for past aid, ramped in response. The tricolored triumph of Genet fanned the popular flame; the Marseillaise thundered in the streets of Philadelphia; literature and the drama caught the echo, and the politicians fought in our capital the battles of the Jacobins and Girondins. Naturally with the growth of atheism in France and the enormities of the Terror an American reaction set in. All this the author has portrayed in a scholarly manner, adding a valuable bibliography.

Mr. Hazen's research is thorough, his interpretation lucid. His work has a distinct value both for the student of the French Revolution and for his fellow-worker in the contemporary American period.

JAMES EUGENE FARMER.

Nullification and Secession in the United States. A History of the Six Attempts during the First Century of the Republic. By EDWARD PAYSON POWELL. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1897. Pp. xi, 461.)

THIS book purports to be a history of six attempts at nullification and secession in the United States. It consists of eight rambling chapters, each of which is followed by an appendix containing documents apparently selected at random. The first chapter deals with the formation of the Union, and the last with the danger to the permanency of the republic. The six intermediate chapters discuss what the author regards as the six overt acts of disunion, viz., the nullification resolutions of 1798, the plot for a Northern confederacy in 1803-4, Burr's attempt at cleaving the Union in the Southwest, New England nullification in 1812-14, South Carolina nullification in 1832, secession in 1861.

The author states that his work was written for a purpose. It was his desire to state facts as viewed from a strictly national point of view, and to aid thereby in creating a more generous national sentiment and a

conviction that political righteousness has not been the exclusive property of any one part of the United States. His principles and conclusions are all the most loyal supporter of the Southern view of the Union could wish. He belittles the Federalists and their achievements, classes Hamilton with Burr, extols Jefferson, justifies the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, and smooths over the nullification and secession movements. He upholds the compact theory of the Constitution, denying that the Supreme Court is the final arbiter, and accepts and extends the historical theory of the Constitution advanced by Mr. Lodge and supported by Professors Channing and Woodrow Wilson. His views are perhaps sufficiently indicated in the summary of his discussion of secession. The final attempt at secession was "the result of the drawing of a geographical line, on opposite sides of which the attempt was made to sustain diverse and conflicting forms of labor. There grew up institutions and customs, theories, and sentiments so entirely opposite that opposition must express itself with constantly increasing bitterness. Separation had been suggested on either side with about equal frequency; nullification of Congressional acts had been undertaken on both sides; nor had the Supreme Court been held by either the North or the South as final arbiter. State rights had been affirmed by Northern as well as by Southern states, and there was no difference as to the principles of state integrity and state sovereignty. The North would have separated from the South had not the South undertaken to secede from the North" (p. 366).

Mr. Powell has not made a substantial contribution to our literature dealing with the nature of the Union. He has said nothing new that will stand criticism, and has not given an especially forcible presentation of views familiar to students. It astonishes one to find that he dignifies Burr's conspiracy as an attempt at secession and that he makes so much of the plot of a few irresponsible disgruntled New England politicians in 1803-4. Part of Chapter I. and its appendix, and all of Chapters III. and IV. with their appendices should have been omitted. The book as a whole is unscientific, unbalanced, illogical and partial. The weak criticism (p. 375) of Dr. von Holst's proposition that the states by accepting the Constitution fused themselves thereby and at once into a nation; the contention (p. 67) that Virginia distinctly reserved the right to withdraw from the Union; and the statements that it was the Mrs. Eaton episode which hurled Calhoun back on South Carolina and sectionalism (p. 283) and that the deep cause of South Carolina's action in two rebellions was state character (p. 285), are typical. The work cannot be regarded as a history at all; it is rather a series of crude essays. It will scarcely interest the general reader and cannot be of value to specialists.

DAVID F. HOUSTON.